

RECEIVED

EIS000467

OCT 26 1993

13 MR. KAMPS: Hello, ladies and
14 gentlemen. Thank you for this opportunity to speak
15 again. I spoke earlier today, but I do have some
16 more comments I would like to make.

17 My name is Kevin Kamps and I work for
18 Nuclear Information and Resource Services in
19 Washington, D.C. and my title is nuclear waste
20 specialist.

21 After speaking earlier today, I took some
22 time to reflect on things I heard earlier and wanted

/

1 to make the following remarks. Something I think
2 that is very important for the record and my first
3 point, and it has been said by a number of speakers
4 today, is that [the no action alternative is
5 ridiculous, that waste would stay at sites in
6 perpetuity with no institutional controls.

7 I just wanted to point out that current
8 United States law requires, instructs the Department
9 of Energy, upon a decision to disqualify Yucca
10 Mountain, to go back to the United States Congress
11 within six months. This would reinitiate the
12 process for a search for a solution to the nuclear
13 waste dilemma. So there are provisions in current
14 law that address the no action alternative and these
15 were not taken into consideration.]

2 [Another point that I would like to make is
17 that the proposal to make Yucca Mountain the
18 national repository for high-level nuclear waste
19 does not concentrate the waste in one site, as the
20 nuclear industry would have us believe, but, rather,
21 it is one more site in the country that would be a
22 location of high-level nuclear waste.

1 At reactors around the country as soon as
2 waste is removed and there is more room to generate
3 more, there will be more waste on those sites as
4 well, and when you consider the transportation
5 shipments of waste, that creates literally thousands
6 of more waste sites around the country. So it is
7 not one site. It just adds one more site and adds
8 thousands of more sites.]

7
continued
on page 4

9 [I wanted to speak to the German experience
10 with high-level radioactive waste transports and
11 emphasize the importance of full public
12 participation in decisionmaking processes.

13 In recent years there was one incident of
14 nuclear waste transportation in Germany involving
15 only six casks. There were 20,000 protesters.
16 There was a deployment of 30,000 police to guard the
17 casks, the largest deployment of police forces since
18 the Nazi regime in Germany. There were 500 arrests
19 made due to nonviolent civil disobedience, and
20 despite the resistance being nonviolent, there were
21 175 injuries to civilians. The total cost for
22 transporting six casks in Germany was \$120 million.

7
continued
on page 5

1 The following shipment of another six
2 casks that took place about a year later resulted in
3 a very chaotic situation. The German government,
4 fearing that a similar protest would occur, did not
5 announce the true date for the shipments and,
6 instead, only a few government officials knew the
7 true date. The rest of the country believed that
8 the date was a week later.

9 So when it became evident that the
10 shipment was underway, instead of 20,000 protesters,
11 only 3,000 were able to show up. But in the ensuing
12 chaos a police officer was killed. He was struck by
13 a train, not the shipment train, but it just seems
14 an indication of the chaos that took place, that the
15 police did not even know until the moment of
16 transport that they were to be deployed. They were
17 caught off guard as well.

18 And it is interesting to mention that
19 German police unions have registered their
20 disapproval and unwillingness to continue guarding
21 these transports because they have to spend so much
22 time near the casks and the gamma radiation that is

7
continued

1 emitted is a significant dose to them when
2 kilometers of people need to be arrested and removed
3 to force the transport through. Again, it was a
4 situation of shoving the waste down the throats of a
5 community that didn't want it and had been excluded
6 from the decisionmaking process.]

3

7 [I wanted to address the lack of realistic
8 accident scenarios. Right here in Washington, D.C.
9 we are on the transport route of 146 rail casks
10 projected from the North Anna Nuclear Plant on the
11 CSXT rail line that passes right through Union
12 Station, along the Metro stations, through Silver
13 Spring. This was the very same tracks where the
14 Amtrak and MARC trains collided in 1996, the deadly
15 and fiery crash. So accidents do happen. CSXT was
16 found partly responsible for this accident because
17 they had removed safety sensors on the rail lines.]

4
continued
on page 6

18 [Another issue that I wanted to address is
19 terrorism. There was an interesting convergence of
20 headlines in Michigan about a year ago where a train
21 accident was on the front page of the Kalamazoo
22 Gazette, where I am from, where there was a large

1 spill of diesel fuel involved in southwestern
2 Michigan, and on the same front page right next to
3 it was the reporting of a conviction of Michigan
4 Militia members who were found guilty of conspiring
5 to attack interstate highways in southwestern
6 Michigan.

7 Both the rail line and the interstate
8 highway are projected transport routes for
9 high-level nuclear waste, and I found it very
10 interesting that these two headlines appeared next
11 to each other. What is a better target for
12 terrorists than truck shipments of high-level
13 nuclear waste on interstate highways?

14 I also wanted to address the issue of
15 low-level radiation and its effects on human
16 health. There is a growing body of scientific
17 literature that is finding a disproportionate level
18 of harm associated with low-level radiation.

19 There was a conference in New York City in
20 September of '98 that was sponsored by the STAR
21 Foundation, Seeking Truth About Radiation, and a
22 number of the scientific researchers who spoke found

4

5
continued
on page 7

1 that at low levels of radiation there was a
2 disproportionate amount of harm done to human
3 health. So that applies to this environmental
4 impact statement, to consider these effects on human
5 health. This new research.]

5
continued

6 [I wanted to conclude with some remarks
7 going back to the public utility commissioner from
8 Michigan who spoke today.] Being from Michigan
9 myself, I wanted to address some of his points
10 directly.

6
(cont'd.)

11 [He mentioned that 3,000 safe transports
12 have been conducted in the last 20 years in the
13 United States. And I would just like to point out
14 that the Department of Energy has a document that
15 reports 72 incidents involving spent nuclear fuel
16 transports. So there are undeniably going to be
17 accidents with this material.]

18 [As far as the necessity for the
19 environment and jobs that nuclear power provides,
20 nuclear energy industry ads are being challenged for
21 being inaccurate in the newspapers and on the radio
22 claiming to be emission free.

8
continued
on page 8

1 In the Great Lakes alone there are
2 emissions emitted into the Great Lakes, uranium
3 mining in the Great Lakes, all of which has
4 contributed to a growing inventory of radionuclides
5 in the Great Lakes. All stages of the nuclear fuel
6 chain are involved in this as well.

7 MR. LAWSON: Can I suggest that
8 you wrap up your comments. If you want to come back
9 later, we will have a chance for that, too.

10 MR. KAMPS: I would like to
11 conclude with a thought, that in our Pledge of
12 Allegiance we say one nation under God indivisible
13 with liberty and justice for all. And I feel that
14 cramming this project down the throat of Nevada does
15 not fulfill our highest ideals as a nation. Thank
16 you.

17 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

18 MS. BOOTH: Thank you.

19 MR. LAWSON: The next speaker is
20 Michelle Cothburn, then Brian O'Connell.